

FAKE DEMOCRACIES AND THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE CHRISTIAN NOTION OF PERSON.

Teresa Forcades

'Fake democracies' are systems of governance that allow their citizens to vote, but then lack effective controls to avoid that those elected legislate and rule against the interests or even against the explicit will of the majority. This is a complex phenomenon of Western capitalist societies at the turn of the 21st. century that needs to be studied carefully. In my presentation, I will analyze some theological aspects of the Christian notion of 'person' in order to inspire a revolutionary subject able to unmask these fake democracies and substitute them for systems of governance more just and more efficient. The aspects analyzed will be: co-creation, unity in diversity, the inseparability of love and freedom and metanoia.

In their introduction to this congress, the organizing committee asks what are the contributions that the theological perspectives of different religions can offer in order to substantially diminish economic and epistemic violence.

My contribution assumes that the Christian theological perspective is able to ground today a notion of subject able to unmask the fake democracies characteristic of Western capitalist societies at the beginning of the 21st. century and able to substitute them by systems of governance more just and efficient. As the Christian theological tradition of 'liberation theology' has clearly stated from its conception, far from being an accidental aspect of Christianity, the work for social justice and the 'preferential option for the poor' are its criteria of authenticity (Matt 25,31-46) ¹. My presentation does not assume that this potential of social transformation is exclusive of Christianity. I will develop the Christian perspective because it is the one I know and the one with which I identify, but I wish to state at the beginning of my talk that perspectives of 'liberation theology' do exist in all main religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism and Islam). ²

What does it mean to talk about 'fake democracies' and what does it mean to consider 'fake democracies' characteristic of Western capitalist societies at the beginning of the 21st. century? I have developed this topic in detail elsewhere ³; here will suffice to define the notion of 'fake democracy' in a succinct way and to illustrate it with an example. Under 'fake democracy' I designate the political system that allows that the economic power be above the will of the people and above the interests of the majority. One example: in June 2009, Margaret Chan, then general director of the WHO, announced the maximal level of international health alarm due to the swine-flu pandemic ⁴; at the same time, the WHO and the governments that are part of it accepted that the

¹ Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *Teología de la liberación*. Lima, 1971.

² Queen CS, King SB. *Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist liberation movements in Asia*. SUNY Press, 1996. Dabashi, Hamid. *Islamic liberation theology: resisting the empire*. Routledge, 2008. Ellis, Marc H. *Toward a Jewish Theology of Liberation: the Challenge of the 21st Century*. Baylor University Press, 2004.

³ Forcades i Vila, Teresa. *Crítica ètica del capitalisme*. Editorial Dau, 2013 (in press).

⁴ Chan, Margaret. *World now at the start of 2009 influenza pandemic*. Statement to the press by WHO- Director General. June 11th, 2009.
http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/statements/2009/h1n1_pandemic_phase6_20090611/en/index.html

commercialization of the pandemic flu vaccine be restricted to four pharmaceutical companies and warned that there might be a shortage of the vaccine due to the fact that these four companies could not be expected to meet the needs of the international demand.⁵ In the context of such an international health alarm, why were not all laboratories able to manufacture the vaccine put urgently to work in order to make sure that there would be enough vaccine for everybody? The four companies that were granted the exclusive commercialization of the pandemic flu vaccine in the context of a health crisis that threatened to take millions of lives are part of the elite-group of the most prosperous business in the world⁶, ¿how is it possible that the financial interests of these four companies were valued more than the life of millions of people?⁷ The governments that allowed this to happen are ‘fake democracies’ because, despite defending in word the people’s sovereignty and the notion of common good as their goal, in the practice its decisions are subservient to the interests of big transnational companies⁸. This example allows us to highlight the association between economic violence and democratic discourse that characterizes contemporary societies: the elected politicians defend democracy and human rights as the biggest values while at the same time allowing the establishment and the continuity of alliances with the economic power that render these words empty.

Confronted with such an epistemic and structural violence, let us turn to the notion of ‘person’ that emerges from the Christian tradition to assess whether can it help us overcome it.

1. Co-creation

According to classical Christian theology, the world has been created by means of a free act of love and it is not yet finished⁹. It will finish only when all creatures who are part of this creation will reach their fullness and this, in the case of the human being created

⁵ Shear M, Stein R. Why such a shortage of swine flu vaccine? The Washington Post. October 27, 2009.

⁶ Herper, Matthew. The most productive drug companies of the past 10 years. April 15th, 2013. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewherper/2013/04/15/the-most-productive-drug-companies-of-the-past-10-years/>

Japsen, Bruce. Obamacare will bring Drug Industry \$35 Billion in Profits. May 25th, 2013. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/brucejapsen/2013/05/25/obamacare-will-bring-drug-industry-35-billion-in-profits/>

⁷ Munos, Bernard. We the People vs. the Pharmaceutical Industry. April 29th, 2013. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmunos/2013/04/29/the-pharmaceutical-industry-vs-society/>

⁸ Forcades i Vila, Teresa. Els crims de les grans companyies farmacèutiques (The crimes of the big pharmaceutical companies). Quaderns Cristianisme i Justícia. June 2006. Translated into Spanish (2006) and English (2006).

⁹ The notion of ‘creatio continua’ (continous creation) appears, among others, in the writings of Maximus the Confessor and Hildegard von Bingen. S. Maximi Confessoris. Orationes Dominicae brevis expositio. PG 90, 884. Hildegard of Bingen. Commentary on the Johannine Prologue (translated and introduced by Barbara Newman). *Theology Today* 60 (2003): 16-33. Cf. also the biblical foundations of the notion of ‘creatio continua’ in Levenson, Jon. Creation and the Persistence of Evil. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

in the image of God, amounts to divinization by means of free acts of love, by means of acts of creation able to interrupt the causal chain to give rise to something 'new' ¹⁰.

The notion of co-creation is united to the notion of 'personal freedom' without which the structural injustice present in the world would be impossible to overcome. If the subject were not able to create, that is, to imagine and to realize something truly 'new', it would then be possible to manipulate her until her capacity for resistance be completely annulled. But this is not the case. Despite being painfully obvious that people can be manipulated, subjective freedom emerges once and again in history as fight for justice and as hope for a better world. It has not been annulled until now and according to Christian belief it will never be because it is an essential component of being human.

The fight for greater social justice is not a utopian struggle, because all those who undertake it experience 'realized eschatology': the future good of the fullness of life is already anticipated in the fight at a subjective level – life has meaning, has inner fullness --, and at the objective level as well – you live with others, you fight side by side, you share and you celebrate. Existential solitude gives rise to communion.

Besides being inseparable from 'personal freedom', the notion of co-creation is intimately linked to the notion of 'providence', that is God's promise that human life, no matter how violent its circumstances might be, will remain always open to the possibility of realizing a free act of love ¹¹. Such an act cannot be judged at the human level, only God can know its concrete value. For instance, the free act of love possible to Jesus at the cross went unnoticed for the majority; however, in it was concentrated all the love and all the sovereign freedom of the creator God ¹². Providence so understood has nothing to do with 'providentialism', that is: *at the end of the day, God's plans do always prevail*. No. God's plans do not always prevail, because God's will is that there is no pain and no tears and the pain and the tears that God absolutely does *not* want did happened during the life of Jesus and continue to happen daily in our time.

This notion of 'providence' rules out the possibility to take refuge in a notion of God able to magically solve all problems, and confronts the person with her existential freedom: instead of waiting for a savior, we are invited to acknowledge that salvation is in our hands and that God, far from being a substitute of my own freedom, is its ultimate warrant. Salvation is in our hands, not in our individual hands, but in our collective

¹⁰ In the words of Saint John of the Cross: *'Y no hay que tener por imposible que el alma aspire en Dios, como Dios aspira en ella, por modo participado. Porque, dado que Dios le haga merced de unirla en la Santísima Trinidad, en que el alma se hace deiforme y Dios por participación, ... esto es, transformada en las tres Personas en potencia y sabiduría y amor, y en esto semejante el alma a Dios, y para que pudiese venir a esto la crió a su imagen y semejanza'* (cf. Cántico B 39,4).

¹¹ Forcades i Vila, Teresa. *La Providencia como comunión*. Iglesia Viva, 254 (Repensar la Providencia). Abril-Junio, 2013: 49-60.

¹² *'San Juan de la Cruz afirma que Jesús en toda su vida no realizó obra mayor que cuando quedó inmóvil, clavado en la cruz, sin poder hacer nada absolutamente, en total desamparo de soledad y abandono. '... en él hizo la mayor obra que en toda su vida con milagros y obras había hecho ... que fue reconciliar y unir al género humano por gracia con Dios' (2 Subida 7,11). En este momento es cuando el Espíritu brota del costado abierto de Jesús en forma de agua y de sangre que nos arrastra como un torrente de vivificación hacia el centro de nosotros mismos, hacia la unificación de nuestro ser en el misterio de muerte y resurrección'*, Kaufmann Cristina. La transparencia de l'invisible. Editorial Claret: Barcelona, 2007, p. 110.

hands¹³. Against the capitalist individualism that isolates people and makes each one separately responsible for her individual destiny, emerges the notion of collective responsibility: 'Cain, where is your brother?'¹⁴ Ruth understood and thanks to her the people of ancient Israel had a future¹⁵. Thanks to all the anonymous Ruths of history people of all nations continue having a future. Nobody can substitute or take away my personal responsibility for my own actions, but the social determinants of my happiness and my wellbeing and, very particularly, the social determinants of the happiness and the wellbeing of those most vulnerable among us, are a collective responsibility.

2. Unity in diversity

'Queer' is an English word equivalent to 'rare' used in the 90s to stigmatize British homosexuals. In their response, some of the homosexual activists appropriated the word to show that what was particularized in them and denounced as something negative, was in reality a positive singularity of all free human beings¹⁶. 'Queer' was then defined as 'unclassifiable'. Thus, the supposed insult implicit in the fact of not fitting within certain heterosexual categories, was turned into an opportunity to analyze critically the criteria of social normalization: what is the origin of the social categories used to classify people sexually? And, beyond the sexual domain, what is the origin of the social categories used to classify people in general? Is it desirable that people who do not fit in these categories can finally be re-inscribed in them? Or is it rather more desirable that those who do fit come to acknowledge their uniqueness, the irreducibility that identifies them and everybody else as 'free beings beyond all labels'?

The notion of person shaped by classical Trinitarian theology distinguishes itself precisely because it emphasizes the unique and irreducible character of personal identity and because it develops a notion of 'unity' inseparable of 'diversity'¹⁷. In the West (Parmenides, Plato) as well as in the East (Hindu notion of 'maya' as illusion or delusion¹⁸), classical dominant philosophical currents have tended to conceive the diversity of the world as 'suboptimal', as a superficial expression of a deeper unitarian truth that only the wise person is able to grasp. Wisdom has consequently been defined

¹³ *For where two or three are gathered in my name, I am there among them* (Matt 18, 20).

¹⁴ Gn 4, 8-10.

¹⁵ But Ruth said, "Do not press me to leave you or to turn back from following you! Where you go, I will go; Where you lodge, I will lodge; your people shall be my people, and your God my God." Rut 1, 16.

¹⁶ *One of the most famous attempts by the LGBT community to re-claim the term "queer" was through an organisation called [Queer Nation](#), which was formed in March 1990; a few months later, an influential though anonymous flier was distributed at the [New York Gay Pride Parade](#) in June 1990 entitled "Queers Read This".* From Wikipedia, accessed on August 11, 2013: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Queer>.

¹⁷ Forcades i Vila, Teresa. *Ser persona, avui: estudi del concepte de 'persona' a la teologia trinitaria clàssica i de la seva relació amb la noció moderna de 'llibertat' com a 'autodeterminació'*. Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat: Barcelona, 2011.

¹⁸ Bhattacharji, Sukumari. *The Indian Theogony: A Comparative Study of Indian Mythology from the Vedas to the Puranas*. Cambridge University Press, 1970; p. 35: *Maya* means ,wisdom, extraordinary or supernatural power, (only in earlier language), but later it comes to mean ,illusion, unreality, deception, fraud, trick, sorcery, witchcraft and magic' (Monier Williams, Diccionari).

as the capacity of perceiving the truth of unity behind the misleading appearance of multiplicity. This dominant idealistic trend has co-existed together with counter-discourses that have elevated diversity to the highest ontological degree and have considered unity to be illusory ¹⁹.

In such a context, the Christian theological notion of 'God the Trinity' affirms the simultaneity of unity and diversity and their mutual implication ²⁰. Diversity cannot be a suboptimal category for the Christian thought because it is present in God self. Divine perfection and truth, far from being incompatible with diversity, are in fact intrinsically linked to it. The only perfection praised in the Gospels is that of love and love cannot subsist in uniformity ²¹. Love needs difference to exist. There is a 'no' in God the Trinity; it is not the 'no' of negation, but the 'no' of irreducible otherness ²²: the Father is *not* the Son and will never be, the Son is *not* the Father and will never be, the Spirit is neither Father nor Son and neither Father nor Son are the Spirit, but they three are one single God. Despite its paradoxical formulation, the simultaneity of unity and diversity is a familiar experience in true love. In true love, all those involved experience a personal growth, a fostering of their individual originality and at the same time an increased capacity of recognizing the originality of the others while feeling more and more united with them.

Classical Trinitarian theology has given the technical name of 'perichoresis' to the loving relationship that unites and constitutes the three divine persons ²³. The prefix 'peri' means 'around' and the root 'choreo' can be translated by 'to make place'. Thus, love, according to Trinitarian theology, implies 'to make place around the loved one', to ease her way so that she can be in fullness, even when her fullness takes her away from me or runs contrary to my interests (cf. Jesus' prayer to his Father in the garden of Getsemani ²⁴). According to the Gospel of John, the loving relationship of the three divine persons is

¹⁹ Heráclito de Éfeso (544 – 484 a.C): "*Lo contrario se opone de acuerdo; y de lo diverso la más hermosa armonía pues todas las cosas se originan en la discordia.*" (Sobre la naturaleza, referencia a los contrarios, 8).

²⁰ Thomas Aquinas: "Unum non est remotivum multitudinis, sed divisionis" (Unity does not exclude diversity, but division); *Summa Theologica*, pars prima, q. 30, a. 3 ad 3.

²¹ Richard of Saint Victor: *Thus, who has an incommunicable difference has equally an incommunicable existence. As a consequence, in the divinity there are as many persons as incommunicable existences* (De Trinitate, 4.17).

²² *In den differenten Personen der Trinität ist ein wirkliches Nicht- und Anderssein immer schon mitgegeben; es gehört zum 'inneren' Selbstvollzug Gottes: Gott, der Schöpfer und Urgrund allen Seins, enthält als der Eine ebenso ursprünglich Differenz und Vielheit in sich, die dann in der Pluriformität der Schöpfung ihre 'Verlängerung' und 'Abbildung' findet. Gott ist nicht nur Prinzip der Einheit der Schöpfung, sondern auch ihrer Vielheit; er ist nicht nur Quelle und Ursprung von Homogenität, sondern von Besonderheit und Vielfalt. So empfängt die Schöpfung vom trinitarischen Gott ihre einzigartige Würde, ihre unbedingte Positivität und eine widerspruchsfreie Erklärung der Bedingung ihrer Möglichkeit. Damit zeigt sich auch die Wahrheit der These von Niklaj A. Berdjajew: 'Keine einzige der Formen des konsequenten, abstrakten Monismus ist imstande, innerlich auch nur den Ursprung der vielfältigen Welt zu erklären'* (N. A. BERDJAJEW, *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, Darmstadt 1925, p.75) Greschake, G. *Der dreieine Gott: eine Trinitarische Theologie*. Herder, 1997; pp. 224-25.

²³ Prestige, G.L. *God in Patristic Thought* SPCK, 1964: p.291. The first author who used the verb ,perichoreo' was Gregorius of Nazianz (s. IV). The noun ,perichoresis' can be found for the first time in the writings of Maximus the Confessor (s. VII).

²⁴ Lk 22, 39-46.

not exclusive for them but, surprising as it might be (and this is one of the most daring aspects of Christianity), it is precisely the model according to which human relationships are to be understood (cf. chapter 17 in the gospel of John; up to four times, Jesus prays that his disciples be 'one' precisely in the same way that he and his Father are 'one').

From the social and political perspective, the consequence of unity in diversity and of the respect for the irreducible personal originality of each is the fostering of plurality. Instead of tolerating plurality as a lesser good and hoping that it will progressively decrease to give rise to a common view, plurality needs to be valued and fostered as a good in itself, as the most cherished good of all human groups and all authentically democratic societies. In this sense, those labeled 'queer' and all people who do not fit fulfill a prophetic task.

3. The inseparability of love and freedom

Patriarchal society considers men more able than women to act freely, that is, to act against the opinions or the expectations of significant others; conversely, it considers women more able than men to love, that is, to sacrifice oneself, to give priority to the needs and desires of the significant others and to act accordingly even when this goes against one's own interests or preferences²⁵. I believe that these patriarchal stereotypes of masculinity and femininity are neither artificial nor essential. I believe that they reflect the persistence in the adult life of certain trans-historical childhood psychic structures and subjectivation patterns²⁶. The little girl is able to identify with the most significant adult and the reference figure in the early childhood, that is, the mother (she herself is likely to become a mother some day) in a way that the little boy cannot (he'll never conceive a child, be pregnant, give birth; he'll never be 'a mother'). I believe that what patriarchal society calls men's 'greater capacity for freedom' is rather 'greater fear of dependency', fear to be dominated by a women-figure like they were in their early childhood. I believe that what patriarchal society calls women's 'greater capacity for love' is rather 'greater fear of loneliness', fear to have to have to account for one's life on its own terms, independently of what the significant others need or desire, fear to conceive one's self independently of the maternal role²⁷. Thus, a revolutionary subject able to think the common life without resorting to violence, needs to move beyond the gender stereotypes in her anthropological understanding, in order to open subjectivity and inter-subjectivity to irreducible personal originality, to what is new and unique in each person.

The Christian proposal is essentially anti-patriarchal when it associates the fullness of humanity to a second birth that does not have the 'mother figure' as a referent but the 'water and the Spirit' (John 3,1-15). In Paul's words: 'in Christ Jesus there is neither feminine nor masculine' (Gal 3,28).

The Christian notion of 'personal freedom', in coherence with the Trinitarian perichoresis that confers to each divine person a distinctive identity inseparable from

²⁵ Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice*. Harvard University Press, 1982.

²⁶ Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. University of California Press, 1978.

²⁷ Forcades i Vila, Teresa. *Feminist Freedom: A dialogue between the psychoanalytical insights of J. Lacan and N. Chodorow and classical Trinitarian theology*. ESWTR Yearbook, 2008: 99-115. Cf. tb. Forcades i Vila, Teresa. *Hacia una sociedad de iguales*. Iglesia Viva, 239: 31-48.

the relationship to the other persons, expresses itself in the Augustinian distinction between 'libertas' and 'liberum arbitrium'²⁸. 'Liberum arbitrium' is the capacity to choose. Without it, it would not be possible to speak of freedom. But the capacity to choose is not yet 'freedom'. I can use my capacity to choose according to what other people expect of me instead of using it according to my own convictions or desires; I can choose 'the already known' out of fear to make a mistake or out of fear to be punished. *Freedom* is only present when I use my *capacity to choose* to choose what I really want and this, according to Christian anthropology, results always in an act of love. An act of love can be to separate from your husband; an act of love can be an act of civil disobedience. The expulsion of the merchants out of the temple in Jerusalem, for instance²⁹, is theologically conceived as an act of love, an expression of Jesus' loving divine identity that none of his actions can contradict.

It is then clear that some acts of love can be vigorous, surprising or even violent. What characterizes an act of love is what inspires it, and this only God can judge. From the standpoint of Christian anthropology, it is basic to expose as false the notion of 'freedom' as something *previous* to 'love'. Freedom and love are necessarily simultaneous. Love cannot be 'postponed' because of freedom. Freedom cannot be postponed because of love. In the words of the anarchist tradition: 'I will not be free until we all are free'. Or, in words of saint Augustin: 'Love and do what you want'³⁰. The act of love is always a loving act because human beings have been created from/for love and only decide to act contrary to love when dominated by fear, i.e., when we suspect that the loving act will have negative consequences for us. Against love, we only act out of fear. This is why there is no chance that a non-loving act can be a *free* act.

From a social perspective, the consequence of the inseparability of love and freedom is the discrediting of individualism (personal fulfillment to the exclusion of others) as existentially inconsistent, but without weakening the notion of personal responsibility. The anthropology of the inseparability of love and freedom is contrary to the capitalist premise of the search of the maximal individual profit and it is likewise contrary to the so-called anthropologies of complementarity, because they essentialize gender identities. I believe that gender identities are cultural constructs with a trans-cultural core, but I don't consider this core an essential positive feature of who I am. According to the Gospel, the only essential feature in us is our being 'daughters/sons of God' and this – as argued in the previous section – is a *queer* identity, a dynamic identity that can be neither classified nor essentialized.

4. metanoia

One last feature of the Christian vision of the world and the person relevant for social transformation is the notion of 'homo viator'³¹. 'Homo viator' designates the pilgrim character of human experience, its provisionality, the impossibility to conceive absolute

²⁸ Pegueroles, Joan. 'Libertas', fin del 'liberum arbitrium' según san Agustín. *Augustinus* 39 (1994): 365-72.

²⁹ Mk 11, 15-18 and parallels.

³⁰ St. Augustin: Homilies on the Gospel of John; Homilies on the First Epistle of John; Soliloquies (edited by Philip Schaff). New York: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886: p. 657 <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf107.html> [PL 34: 1977-2062]

³¹ Pieper, Josef. *Unaustinkbares Licht: Das Negative Element in der Weltansicht des Thomas von Aquin*, Munich: Kosel- Verlag 1963, p. 129.

realities in time and space. In words of bishop, liberation theologian and poet Pere Casaldàliga: ‘There are only two absolutes: God and hunger’³². Outside these two, all is relative and it is not possible to reach any paradise on earth. Despite this, the Christian notion of ‘homo viator’ does not imply ‘quietism’ or political passivity, quite the contrary. In liberation theology, the sobriety that comes from knowing that there is no lasting ‘final solution’ transforms itself in strength for the long-term struggle, in capacity to persevere in the pursue of social justice without the illusion of easy fixes. The consciousness of being an ‘homo viator’, a pilgrim, allows us the necessary critical distance with all concrete realizations of the ideal of living together, be it at the intimate level (couple, family, friendship) or at the social level. This critical distance belongs together with true commitment, because it does not arise from the suspicion that there is a better alternative. It is a critical distance that manifests itself precisely from within the conviction that my present commitment is the best possible at the moment, because being the best possible does not mean that it is perfect or definitive. The critical distance keeps one’s eyes open to perceive when ‘more of the same’ becomes a betrayal, to perceive the right moment for the necessary change, the moment to invite new people or new ideas in.

From the idea of the ‘homo viator’ emerges the theological notion of ‘metanoia’³³. *Metanoia* or ‘conversion’ relates to the notion of *permanent revolution* because both define reality as ‘open’ and prescribe the need to reassess constantly one’s position in relationship to one’s ideal. In Hebrew, the word ‘conversion’ (shuv) indicates ‘movement, turn’³⁴; it gives witness to the dynamic and provisional character of everything human. In a revolutionary political context, it is not possible to think that a break with an unjust system will be achieved simply by the replacement of the present leaders by better ones. It is necessary to change the structures of power in order to make them truly participative; it is necessary to maximize the democratic quality of the checks and balances involved. The very notion of democracy presupposes this openness and this dynamic balance, but the current western examples of democracy do not allow that the people take the political power into their hands. To vote every three, four or five years is not enough. We need democratic institutions that foster true popular participation and collective decision-making at the local level; the people of a democratic nation need to have effective power to terminate a political mandate when it is not proceeding according to expectations; the accountability of those in power needs to be real and controlled by the community of those affected by their decisions. The recent revolutionary experiences in some Latin American countries (Bolivia, Venezuela, Ecuador...) show that it won’t be easy. The crux of the matter is not to establish finally the ‘right structure’ at the political, the social or the economic level, but to recognize that all revolution has the potential to betray itself and to establish a system of checks and balances flexible enough to react to ever changing circumstances. It seems obvious, in this sense, that smaller political units have a greater democratic potential than bigger ones when operating within a constitution that guarantees the basic rights and precludes the concentration of power in a few hands.

³² Interview to Pere Casaldàliga: ‘Todo es relativo, menos Dios y el hambre’. Redes Cristinas. 5 abril 2007.

<http://www.redescristianas.net/2007/04/05/todo-es-relativo-menos-dios-y-el-hambre-entrevista-a-pedro-casaldaliga/>

³³ Cf., among others: Matt 18, 21-35; Acts 26,20; Rev 2,5

³⁴ Cf., among others: Hos 6,1; Is 30,15; Dan 4,34; Jer 8,4; Ruth 1,7 / 1,11 / 1,22 / 4,15

Co-creation, unity in diversity, inseparability of love and freedom and metanoia; in other words: political responsibility at the personal and the collective levels, fostering of plurality and queer identities, overcoming of gender stereotypes and of the false individualistic freedom and permanent revolution. This can be a Christian theological contribution to the necessary and urgent social change. A theological contribution inspired in the gospel that, far from being exclusivist, recognizes itself in dialogue with all other trends of thought that feel as their own the pleas for justice of the poor.